

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/594,163	09/26/2006	Kenichi Koyakumaru	701062	7239		
23460 LEYDIG VOI	7590 03/25/201 T & MAYER, LTD	EXAM	EXAMINER			
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900			CLARK,	CLARK, SARA E		
CHICAGO, II	TETSON AVENUE . 60601-6731	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			1612			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			03/25/2010	ELECTRONIC		

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Chgpatent@leydig.com Chgpatent1@leydig.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/594,163		KOYAKUMARU ET AL.		
Examiner		Art Unit		
	SARA E. CLARK	1612		

	SARA E. CLARK	1612					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence ado	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 15 March 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
<ol> <li>         \[             \]             The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37</li> </ol>	n the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid aba t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request				
periods:  a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection						
	fronths from the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1:						
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exuder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing dat	nally set in the final Office	e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	iled within two month	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		E below);					
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be		lucina or eimplifyina t	he iccuse for				
appeal; and/or	tter form for appear by materially rec	rucing or simplifying t	ne issues ioi				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1</li> </ol>	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).				
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ol>	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
non-allowable claim(s).	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the						
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro</li> </ol>		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-24.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	overcome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation							
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	in or the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	eu.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowar	ce because:				
<ol> <li>Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> </ol>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. Other:							
/Frederick Krass/	/SARA E. CLARK/						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612	Examiner, Art Unit 1612						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant has proposed to amend claims 1 and 7 to recite limitations which define the amount of metal catalyst in terms of molar equivalents. Further consideration and analysis would be required to determine whether this limitation would have been obvious.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments that the newly amended claims are patentable over the prior art references are moot at this time due to non-entry of the proposed amendment.